



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,587	08/30/2001	Chockalingam Arunachalam	DAVOX-173XX	1964

7590 02/03/2004

Bourque & Associates, P.A.
Suite 303
835 Hanover Street
Manchester, NH 03104

EXAMINER

CHOW, MING

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2645

8

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/943,587

Applicant(s)

ARUNACHALAM, CHOCKALINGAM

Examiner

Ming Chow

Art Unit

2645

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: (see attached).
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-18.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2645

1. Applicant argues, on page 13, regarding rejection reference to claimed limitation "IVR". First of all, the prior art Masson et al (US: 4908850) was never cited in the Office Action (Paper No. 6). The cited phrase was to highlight the particular means which is also described by the referenced prior art (Morganstein) on column 3 line 3-6 and column 4 line 47-62. Morganstein teaches on column 3 line 3-6 the call processor receives incoming calls and returned with voice prompts (reads on claimed "IVR"). Morganstein also teaches on column 4 line 47-62 the call processor transmitting voice prompts to calling parties and collecting caller's inputs (reads on claimed "IVR"). There are two prior arts (US: 4696028 and US: 4783796) mentioned on the cited paragraph (column 4 line 47-62), however, it does not mean the two mentioned prior arts are used as rejection basis. The basis of rejection is the referred prior art (Morganstein) – the complete teachings in the prior art. Therefore, the Examiner remains the same ground of rejections by the cited prior art (Morganstein).
2. Applicant argues, on page 14, regarding claimed limitation "means for populating an automatic number identifier (ANI) for each outside call, with a telephone number or extension of a port that received the telephone signal, handled by said IVR not having an ANI and associating said ANI therewith". The way that the limitation claimed in claim 1 is different from what the Applicant argued. The Examiner interprets this limitation to be "Means for populating ANI for each outside call. The populating is handled by said IVR and the IVR does not have an ANI."
3. The Examiner remains same grounds of rejections as stated in Paper No. 6 and the current application remains final.

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

